



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American School
of Classical Studies
in Rome

CERTAIN SOURCES OF CORRUPTION IN LATIN
MANUSCRIPTS :

A STUDY BASED UPON TWO MANUSCRIPTS OF LIVY: CODEX
PUTEANUS (FIFTH CENTURY), AND ITS COPY CODEX REGI-
NENSIS 762 (NINTH CENTURY)¹

I. INTRODUCTION

THE tendency of Latin textual criticism has in late years been more and more in the direction of a conservative adherence to the authority of manuscripts, wherever possible. This may be seen in the gradually diminishing number of emendations and conjectures in the critical apparatus of recent editions of the Latin texts. Scholars now hesitate much longer about marking a word or an expression as corrupt merely because it is unusual. Confidence in all but very late manuscripts is on the increase. Recent years have seen the reinstatement of not a few manuscript readings whose place had long been taken by conjectures. A knowledge of palaeography is more and more becoming an essential factor in textual criticism, and, except in the case of texts which depend wholly upon manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,

¹ In this article, which will appear in successive numbers of the *JOURNAL*, these topics will be discussed, each in a separate chapter: I. Introduction; II. Codex Reginensis 762; III. Mistaken Word-divisions; IV. Dittography; V. Errors of Omission; VI. Confusion of Letters; VII. Confusion of Similar Words; VIII. Corruptions arising from Mistaking the Numeral Signs; IX. Errors due to Abbreviations; X. Errors due to Corrections in the Codex Puteanus; XI. Errors of Conscious Emendation; XII. Spelling and Pronunciation; XIII. Miscellaneous Examples illustrating the Cumulative Growth of Corruptions.

one of the chief tests of an emendation is coming to be,—
Is it capable of palaeographical explanation?

This tendency to place textual criticism more nearly upon a palaeographical basis has not been accompanied by a corresponding change in the character of the illustrative material used in books and manuals upon the subject. The collections of examples now placed before the student are not without their value, but they fail along the lines in which textual criticism has made the greatest advance. These examples consist for the most part in (1) a comparison of the corrupt reading of a manuscript with a conjectured emendation of a scholar, or (2) in a comparison of the readings of two or more manuscripts of the same author, of which the relationship is generally uncertain, or at least remote. Illustrations chosen according to either method are often misleading to the student, even granting that, in the first method, the scholar's conjecture is what the author actually wrote. A great many corruptions to be found in manuscripts of all periods are no longer in their initial stages, but are the complex result of several distinct processes of growth. The student, with nothing before him but what the author is *supposed* to have written and the corrupt reading of, let us say, a thirteenth century manuscript, may be dealing only with a corruption in a late stage. All the earlier steps are missing, and certainty with regard to them is out of the question. Such an illustration has little value for him, leading as it does to no conclusion which is surely right, and possibly to one which is wholly wrong. Likewise, neither of these methods keeps clearly before the student the character of the errors common to certain *styles* of writing and certain *periods* of time. Both of them are lacking in palaeographical details.

To be of the greatest practical value, illustrations of corruptions should fulfil the following conditions: (1) the two extremes which are compared should not be too widely separated; (2) neither of them should be based upon conjecture; (3) each illustration should present but a single stage in the

progress of an error, or at any rate should present but one stage at a time ; (4) the cause of the error should be reasonably certain ; (5) each example should keep distinctly before the student the periods of time and the palaeographical conditions involved. Material for illustrations which would answer all these conditions is not entirely wanting, though little use has heretofore been made of it. It is to be found in a class of neglected manuscripts whose readings have no place in the critical apparatus of the text editions, namely, direct copies of originals which are still extant. The circumstance which renders such copies useless for the constitution of the text of a given author makes them of the greatest value in throwing light upon the history of the texts in general. By comparing such a copy with its original it is possible, as it were, to look over the shoulder of the mediaeval scribe as he sits at his task. One may follow his hand and eye as he copies letter by letter and word by word. The difficulties with which he has to contend either in the script or the text of his original are clearly revealed. It is possible to see exactly how he performed his work, whether faithfully or carelessly, whether he has adhered closely to his text or altered freely, and, when he has made errors, how and why they came to be made. The extent to which the text suffered in his hands is thus made clear in every detail. Illustrations taken from the readings of two such manuscripts, original and copy, would enable the student to draw his own conclusions with full data before him,—the style of the script of the original, the date of each manuscript, the conditions under which the copy was made, and the knowledge that, in the case of corruptions, he is dealing with but a single stage. By this method it is possible to see exactly what, in the copying of a given manuscript, *actually happened*, and then to turn the information to account in considering the texts of other manuscripts produced under the same conditions, the originals of which are now lost.

Examples chosen by this method are as nearly as possible upon a palaeographical basis, and offer the student definite

illustration. The comparison of a single pair of representative manuscripts and the errors arising from a single process of transcription would serve to give him a clear idea of the tendency to corruption at a given period. A study of the errors exhibited in four such sets of copies and originals, each set representing a distinct phase of the history of Latin texts, would give him a more definite conception of the whole field than he can possibly get from the more or less random examples of the manuals. For instance, a ninth century copy of an original of the fourth or fifth century, an eleventh century copy of an original of the ninth, a thirteenth century copy of an original of the eleventh, and a fourteenth or fifteenth century copy of an original of the thirteenth, would serve respectively to illustrate the tendencies of the periods which they represent, and collectively the entire history of Latin texts in so far as extant manuscripts make this possible.

For the last three of these four periods there is no lack of illustrative material of the nature indicated. A search in the libraries would probably disclose an abundance of neglected copies of extant manuscripts. The first of these periods, which is in many respects the most important, is represented, so far as I am aware, only by the single pair of manuscripts which form the subject of the present article. These are (1) the famous codex *Puteanus* (National Library, Paris, 5730), of the fifth century, which contains the third decade of Livy's history, and (2) a ninth century copy of it now in the Vatican library, and catalogued as *Reginensis* 762.

That the significance of these two manuscripts may be properly understood, let me first point out some of the characteristics of the period to which they belong, and the representative nature of the manuscripts themselves. The epoch from the fifth century to the ninth is one which is unique in the history of the texts of the Classical Latin authors. It is marked by a period of almost total inactivity in the multiplication of copies of their works, and is followed by one of unparalleled activity. Almost all of our extant manuscripts of these writers that

are earlier in date than the very end of the eighth century are the capital and uncial manuscripts of the fourth, fifth, and the beginning of the sixth centuries. The interval from the middle of the sixth century to the closing years of the eighth is represented by very few existing manuscripts of any but the Church writers. This fact would seem to indicate that, while there was no lack of activity in the reproduction of the writings of the Christian fathers, the copying of the works of the pagan Latin writers was almost totally arrested for over two centuries.¹ The active production of copies of the works of the pagan writers begins anew with the revival of learning under Charlemagne. To this new and wonderful activity, which arose with the closing years of the eighth century and continued through the tenth, we are indebted for the preservation of a large proportion of our Latin texts.² The task of copying was

¹ Of the authors who wrote before the official victory of Christianity the following works are, to the best of my knowledge, the only ones which have been preserved in manuscripts surely belonging to this period: the Agrimensores, s. VI-VII; Apuleius (?), *de Herbarum Medicaminibus*, s. VI-VII; Ovid, *ex Ponto* (fragment), s. VI-VII; the Pandects, s. VI-VII; Probus (?), *Catholica*, s. VI-VII, VII-VIII, VIII-IX; excerpts from Pliny and Apicius, s. VII-VIII; Censorinus, s. VII; Lactantius, s. VII; Sacerdos, s. VII-VIII; Commodianus, *Carmen Apologeticum*, s. VIII; *Notae Tironis et Senecae*, s. VIII; the Anthology of the Codex Salmasianus, s. VII-VIII. Of these, Commodianus and Lactantius were Christian writers; Probus, Censorinus, and Sacerdos were writers on Grammar; the works of the Agrimensores, the above-mentioned work on *Materia Medica* ascribed to Apuleius, the excerpts from Pliny and Apicius, the Pandects, and the *Notae Tironis et Senecae* were all of a technical or semi-technical nature. It would seem probable, then, that with few exceptions such manuscripts only were copied in the seventh and eighth centuries as, from the nature of their subject-matter, did not conflict with the doctrines of the Church.

² The oldest manuscripts of a large proportion of the extant literature from Plautus to the official victory of Christianity are of the ninth and tenth centuries. The following is a list of the works of which the text is based upon manuscripts of this period (viz., the ninth and tenth centuries, and the last decade of the eighth): Plautus (the Codex Vetus for portions not contained in the Ambrosian palimpsest); Lucretius; Catullus, c. 62; Caesar; Sallust; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; the following works of Cicero: *Pro Fonteio*, *pro Flacco*, *post reditum in senatu*, *post red. ad Quirites*, *de domo sua*, *de haruspicum responsis*, *pro Sestio*, *in Vatinius*, *pro Caelio*, *de provinciis consularibus*, *pro Balbo*, *in Pisonem*, *pro Marcello*, *Philippics*, *Rhetorica*, *de Oratore*, *Brutus*, *Orator*, *Part. Orat.*, *Topica*, *ad Familiares*, *de Legibus*, *Paradoxa*, *Academica*, *Priora*, *Tusc. Disp.*, *de Natura Deorum*, *Cato Maior*, *de Divinatione*, *de Fato*,

performed by monks. The usual practice in the scriptoria of the various monasteries in the ninth century seems to have been to secure, for the purpose of making a copy, the oldest available manuscript of a given author either preserved in the library to which the scriptorium belonged, or borrowed from that of another monastery. The oldest available manuscripts were, in the case of the pagan writers, those of the fourth or fifth century in capital¹ or uncial writing. Consequently the three hundred years from the end of the fifth century to the beginning of the ninth represent but a single link in the history of the texts of those Latin authors whose writings are preserved in manuscripts not earlier than the ninth century. In all that time the text of such an author has passed through but a single stage in the process of corruption. The errors which have crept into the text in the making of the ninth century copy constitute the only difference between the trustworthiness of a ninth century manuscript of a given author and that of its archetype of the fifth.

This single process of transcription marks what is perhaps

Timaeus, *de Amicitia*, *de Officiis*; the *Culex*, *Copa*, *Aetna*, and *Moretum* formerly ascribed to Virgil; Bernese scholia on Virgil; Horace; Ovid, *Amores*, *Heroides*, *de Medicamine Faciei*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*, *Fasti*, *Metamorphoses*, *ex Ponto* (for the greater part), *Halieutica*; Grattii *Cynegetica*; Livy, first decade, with the exception of books III-VI, and the *Periochae*; Justinus; Seneca Rhetor; Verrius Flaccus (*Epitome Pauli*); Hyginus; Vitruvius; *Ara-tea* Germanici; Manilius; Phaedrus; Seneca, *Tragoediae* (excerpta), *Ἀποκολλήματα*, *Dialogues*, *Epistolae*, *de Clementia*, *de Beneficiis*; Valerius Maximus; Curtius Rufus; Persius; Lucan; Quintilian; Calpurnius Flaccus; *Ilias Latina*; Petronius; Valerius Flaccus; Statius; Martial; Juvenal; Tacitus, *Annals* I-VI; Pliny's *Letters*; Pliny the elder; Pomponius Mela; Celsus; Columella; Apicius; Marcellus; Frontinus (except the *de Aquis*); Siculus Flaccus; Nemesianus, *Cynegetica*; *Disticha* and *Monosticha* Catonis; Suetonius; Minucius Felix; Florus, *Bell. Rom.*; Apuleius, *de Platone et eius dogmata*; Calpurnius Flaccus; Terentius Scaurus; Gargilius Martialis; Flavius Capr; Acro; Porphyrio; Gellius; Maecianus; Cyprian; Tertullian; Q. Sere-nus Sammonicus; Scriptores Historiae Augustae; Arnobius. Roughly speaking, this list includes considerably more than half of the extant classical literature, and the ratio of ninth century authoritative manuscripts upon this list to those of the tenth century is about 3 to 1. This shows how important a place the ninth century holds in the preservation of the texts.

¹ Capitals were reserved for favourite authors, Virgil in particular.

the most critical period in the history of Latin texts. It is not in itself characterized by intentional alterations such as are common in manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The corruptions are due almost entirely to ignorance or carelessness on the part of the scribes, much more rarely to attempts at emendation. But, although serious corruptions are few, this period is rich in the germs of future corruptions, on account of a new factor in the making of manuscripts. This factor is the division of the text into words, which now for the first time comes into general practice. In the manuscript of the fifth century there was ordinarily no word-division whatever. The fifth century scribe, if he did not understand the meaning of the text before him, was able to conceal his ignorance and evade all difficulties resulting therefrom by copying letter by letter, a process in which the text of the author suffered but little. The scribe of the ninth century, on the other hand, was forced to make words out of the undivided text of his original, and, with only a superficial understanding of the sense of what he was copying, it is not surprising that he often divided wrongly. The errors thus made are not in themselves difficult to emend, but, simple though they were, they frequently became magnified into grave corruptions in the efforts of the scribes of a later age to restore sense to the passages thus distorted.

Of this important process of transcription no manuscript could be more thoroughly representative than the *Reginensis* 762. The *Puteanus*,¹ from which this copy was made, is a typical manuscript of the fifth century, in uncial script, with words undivided. The *Reginensis* itself is one of the very best examples of the work of the French monasteries at the beginning of the ninth century.² The centre of the new activity in the production of manuscripts, and of the reform in writing which began with the closing years of the eighth century and spread over a large part of Western Europe, was the monastery

¹ For a full description see Introd. to the text edition of A. Luchs.

² A fuller description of the manuscript is given in chap. II.

of St. Martin at Tours. Its abbot Alcuin, who was Charlemagne's minister of education, was the pioneer of the new movement. It was in this monastery that the *Reginensis* was produced, a few years after Alcuin's death. It is written in the reformed script known as the Caroline minuscule. This manuscript is not the work of a single scribe. Eight monks were simultaneously engaged upon it, who, to judge from their orthography, were of more than one nationality. It consequently represents the concentrated efforts of the scriptorium of St. Martin's at the time when this monastery was the centre of the ninth century revival, which was then at its height.

In the present article I have endeavoured to illustrate the tendencies to corruption which characterize the transcription from manuscripts in majuscule writing into Caroline minuscule with divided words, by means of actual examples of scribal errors drawn from a comparison of the readings of the *Puteanus* with those of its copy the *Reginensis*. Since collating the manuscripts in 1896 I have made use of the material collected, in giving courses in Latin palaeography. The results encourage me to believe that the collection may prove helpful to other students and give a clearer idea of the errors common to this important period than they now get from the illustrations in the manuals, which are drawn from miscellaneous sources. The starting-point of the error is in every case certain, being simply the reading of the *Puteanus*. The cause of each error is therefore in the majority of cases beyond dispute. As I have already said, the *Reginensis* is the work of eight scribes, seven of whom have each copied a quota amounting to considerably more than a book of Livy's text. Among them more than one nationality is probably represented. For this reason the errors here given represent the tendencies of the period much more fairly than if they had been drawn from the work of a single scribe.

For convenience of reference, the examples in the following chapters are arranged in categories, with a minimum of commentary on each variety of error. The reading of the *Puteanus*

is usually given first, followed by the erroneous reading in the *Reginensis*. Henceforth the *Puteanus* will be represented by the letter P, and the *Reginensis* by the letter R.¹

To illustrate several stages in the progress of an error I have occasionally made use of the corrections found in both manuscripts. Corrections in P are designated as follows: P¹, if the correction is by the scribe, P², if by the first corrector, P³, if by the second corrector.² Correctors in R are much more difficult to discriminate, owing to the variety of inks and hands (see chaps. II and XI). For our present purpose it will suffice to designate the corrections made by the scribe as R¹, and all later corrections as R². For the purpose of tracing a stage further the corrections begun in the *Reginensis*, I have added in a limited number of cases the readings of *Codex Medicus* (Florence, Laurentian Library, LXIII, 20), which is in turn a copy³ of R. This manuscript will be indicated by the letter M. In all the examples in which I have given several steps in the progress of an error I have tried to keep each stage distinct.

The following exposition is intended, in a general way, to cover all the points of consequence afforded by the study of the two manuscripts. Accordingly, while this paper contains certain new facts and points of view, it of course has also to deal with many that are already familiar — with the special advantage, however, as already shown, that the two points of comparison in each case are actual examples drawn from two extant manuscripts, of which one is the direct copy of the other.

¹ This letter is used by A. Luchs to denote another manuscript of this decade of Livy, in the Spirensian group. No confusion, however, can result, inasmuch as in the present article we are concerned with but three manuscripts, all of which belong to the *Puteanus* group.

² All the corrections in P designated by Luchs as P⁴, P⁵, were made after R had been copied.

³ Although M is in the main a copy of R, its readings seem to indicate, especially in the early portion of the manuscript, that the scribe who copied it had also before him either P or some copy of it other than R. This is a matter which I hope to deal with in another paper.

I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor Wm. Gardner Hale, who suggested this piece of work to me while director of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome (1895-96), and to state, at his request, that his attention was called to the availability of these two manuscripts for the present purpose by Professor W. M. Lindsay, now of the University of St. Andrews. To Professor Hale, and to Professor Frank Frost Abbott of the University of Chicago, I am also deeply grateful for many valuable criticisms.

II. THE CODEX REGINENSIS 762

I have already given in the preceding chapter a general account of R, but my description of it was there confined merely to such points as directly concerned the purpose of the present article. Before proceeding to deal with the errors of its scribes, I shall first give a more detailed account of this manuscript and its making, concerning which a great many more data are known than is usual in the case of manuscripts of so early a date.

Being a copy of an existing original, and more mutilated¹ than the original both at the beginning and at the end, it is of no value for the constitution of the text of the third decade of Livy, though the readings of M, its eleventh century copy, are to be found in the apparatus of the critical editions for the beginning of Book XXI, which is missing in P. But from a purely palaeographical standpoint it is much more interesting than either the *Puteanus* (P), or its own copy, the *Mediceus* (M), and has been the subject of various articles by palaeographical scholars, among whom are Wölfflin,² Chatelain,³ and Traube.⁴ Its interest lies not merely in the fact that it is one of the best

¹ It begins with the words *velut caeci evadunt* (XXII, 6, 5), and ends with *deinceps continua amplexus* (XXX, 5, 7).

² *Philologus*, XXXIII, 1874, pp. 186-189.

³ *Revue de Philologie*, vol. XIV, 1890, p. 79; *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, 9^e livraison, 1895, with facsimile.

⁴ L. Traube, *Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, 1891, Heft 3, p. 425.

examples of the developed calligraphy of Tours, but also in the interesting data furnished by the signatures at the end of the various quaternions, which throw no little light upon the method of procedure in manuscript-making in the Middle Ages.

These signatures occur regularly at the end of each quaternion, as follows: Gysla η , fol. 6; Aldo, fol. 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 52; Fredeğ, fol. 60, 68, 76, 84, 92, 97; Nauto, fol. 103, 111; Theogrīñ or Theogriññ, fol. 119, 127, 135, 141; Theodegrī, fol. 157, 165, 173, 179, 185; Ansoald, fol. 193, 201, 209, 217, 228; Landemarus, fol. 236, 242, 250; each folio being signed upon the *verso* side. The manuscript was therefore the work of eight different scribes, each of whom, to judge from the amount done by those whose work is preserved to us in its entirety, copied about forty-four folios of the text, with the exception of Nauto¹ and Theogriññ, who *together* copied that number. Chatelain noticed² that the end of the work of Gyslarius corresponded, even to a syllable, with the end of quaternion IX of P; that of Aldo, with the end of quaternion XVIII; that of Fredeğ, with quaternion XXVII; that of Nauto and Theogriññ together, with quaternion XXXVI; that of Theodegrī, with quaternion XLV; that of Ansoaldus, with quaternion LIV; and that the writing of the last page of the work of each scribe was spread out or condensed so as to coincide with the end of the quaternion of P. He concluded, therefore, that the old fifth century uncial manuscript had been taken apart, and equal portions, of nine quaternions each, had been given out to the scribes to be copied simultaneously. It has further been pointed out by Traube (*Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, 1891, Heft 3, p. 425), that the names of these scribes are to be found in the *Libri Confraternitatum Sancti Galli*³ in the list of the monks of Tours, and that they all occur in a definite place upon the list, namely, in the second

¹ The work of Nauto stops abruptly about two-thirds of the way down a page (fol. 112 *recto*), and his part was completed by the scribe whose signature was Theogriññ.

² *Revue de Philologie*, vol. XIV.

³ Ed. Piper, *Mon. Germaniae*.

of the seven columns devoted to the monks of St. Martin's of Tours. From this he infers that in the monastery of St. Martin there was a definite class of monks who performed the duty of scribes, and were regularly engaged as such in the scriptorium of the monastery. The names corresponding to the signatures are as follows :

Signatures in R	List in Col. 14, <i>Lib. Confr. S. Galli</i>
Gyslaꝛ	Gislarius (no. 3)
Aldo	Aldo (no. 10)
Fredeġ	Fredegaudus (no. 37)
Nauto	Nauto (no. 36)
Theogrim̃	Teutcrimus (no. 26)
Ansoaldus	Ansoaldus (no. 4)
Landemarus	Landemarus (no. 24)

It will be seen that one name is missing, namely, the one corresponding to the signature Theodegrī, but it is just possible that Theogrim̃ and Theodegrī were one and the same person. Nauto did not finish his full quota of nine quaternions, but stopped abruptly two-thirds of the way down fol. 112 *recto*, after having completed a little over two quaternions. It is possible that Theodegrī, after finishing his own portion, completed that of Nauto, using a different abbreviation in his signature. The abbot at the head of the list of monks of St. Martin's in the *Libri Confraternitatum* is Fridegisus,¹ the successor of

¹ Chatelain, in his *Paléographie des Classiques Latins* (9^e livraison), gives one the impression that the scribe whose signature was Fredeġ, and Fridegisus the abbot, were one and the same person. In the hope that this might prove to be the case, and that I should find in the copy of the third of the scribes the work of a great Carolingian scholar, I studied that part of the manuscript with particular care. There was nothing, however, in the work of the scribe Fredeġ to distinguish it from that of the other scribes. It contained even more than the average number of careless or ignorant blunders, and this portion of the copy could hardly have been made by a man who had a reputation for learning. Other considerations also add to the probability that the abbot was not the copyist. It is hardly likely that the chancellor of Louis le Débonnaire could find time to copy manuscripts with the monks in the scriptorium; and, even if that were probable, he would have chosen the first part of the work in preference to the third. I agree, therefore, with Traube in identifying the scribe whose signature is Fredeġ with Fredegaudus, whose name is number 37 in column 14 of the *Libri Confraternitatum*.

Alcuin, who held the abbacy from 804–834. Traube is consequently justified in placing the date of R between those years. The fact that all these scribes were monks of Tours makes it certain that the work of transcribing was done at Tours; for it is not likely that so many monks would be sent to Corbie to copy the *Puteanus*, which at this time belonged to the monastery of that town. It is much more probable that the uncial manuscript was borrowed¹ for copying, and this supposition would account for the haste shown in putting so many scribes to work upon making the copy, — the concentration, apparently, of the energies of the entire scriptorium upon this one task.

In R we have, therefore, an example of the developed calligraphy of Tours, produced within thirty years of the death of Alcuin. This monastery was, under his abbacy (from 796 to 804, the year of his death), the centre of the new activity in the production of manuscripts and of the reform in writing which spread over almost the whole of western Europe.² The manuscript should therefore be thoroughly characteristic of the new movement, not merely in the style of the writing, but also in respect to the fitness of the ninth century monks for the task of copying the texts of the old Latin writers. In the handwriting of these eight scribes there is little variation. It is almost impossible in the case of several of them to distinguish at first sight the hand of one from that of another, which goes to show that, in this one scriptorium at least, the Caroline minuscule had been brought as nearly as possible to uniformity. On the other hand, it would seem that greater attention was given to uniformity in handwriting than in other features of the work of the copyist. In these there is considerable disparity. For instance, the signature of Theogrîñ is attached to the quaternion which ends with fol. 119vo; but by means of the character of the errors, aside from the writing, one can see

¹ Chatelain suggested this probability before Traube discovered that the scribes of the *Reginensis* were to be identified with the monks of the monastery of St. Martin at Tours.

² Exceptions to this statement are England and Ireland and the monasteries of southern Italy.

that the whole quaternion, and nearly a folio in addition, is not the work of the monk whose name is signed to it, but that of Nauto. The three quaternions copied by this scribe are relatively free from errors, while the quaternions signed with the names of Theogrīñ, Theodegrī, Ansoaldus, and Landemarus are full of absurd blunders. These last-mentioned scribes are each prone to errors which are peculiar to themselves, a fact which, together with variations in orthography which are constant with certain scribes, would seem to indicate that more than one nationality was represented. The majority of the errors found in the manuscript are, however, common to all. They are due, for the most part, to carelessness, to a defective knowledge of Latin that was not sufficient to enable the scribe to understand, except in a more or less random way, the meaning of the text he was copying, and to difficulties arising from lack of familiarity with the continuously written uncial script. Their work shows almost no intentional alteration, and the emendations are of the most superficial nature; indeed, the majority of the scribes did not sufficiently understand the meaning of the text to have been equal to any deliberate emendation of consequence. The errors, though numerous, are in themselves unimportant, but in the hands of scribes of a later age they would undoubtedly have become magnified into serious corruptions.

Each quaternion of the *Reginensis* was corrected, as soon as it was completed, by some person or persons who supervised the work of the scriptorium. This is shown by the similarity between the ink of the correctors and that used by the scribes, and the non-recurrence, in the second quaternion of each scribe's work, of errors which were common in the first. These corrections, which will be treated in a subsequent chapter, are usually of a superficial nature and, in point of scholarship, are not much above the level of those made by the scribes themselves.

It was my first intention to give, along with each scribal error contained in the following chapters, the initial of the

name of the scribe by whom the error was made. The insertion of so many initials, however, seems likely to cause unnecessary confusion. I have therefore indicated in the accompanying table the exact portion of Livy's text copied by each scribe. In the case of each error the number of book, chapter, and section is given, and by referring to this table it will be possible to see at a glance the name of the scribe by whom a given error was made.

INDEX OF PORTIONS COPIED BY THE VARIOUS SCRIBES

- XXII, 6, 5 *uelut caeci evadunt* to XXII, 21, 2 *sed praeterquam quod* copied by Gislarius.
 XXII, 21, 2 *ipsorum Hispanorum* to XXIII, 35, 1 *cum post Can-[nensem]* copied by Aldo.
 XXIII, 35, 1 [*Can]-nensem pugnam* to XXV, 9, 10 *alia portam Tem-[enitida]* copied by Fredeğ.
 XXV, 9, 10 [*Tem]-enitida adiret* to XXV, 39, 14 *cum Hasdrubale* copied by Nauto.
 XXV, 39, 14 *dece* (= *decem*) *millia* to XXVI, 28, 4 *Galliae et le-[gionibus]* copied by Theogrīn.
 XXVI, 28, 4 [*le]-gionibus praeset* to XXVII, 38, 6 *cum omnes cense-[rent]* copied by Theodegrī.
 XXVII, 38, 6 [*cense]-rent primo* to XXVIII, 35, 7 *quod pleni-[us]* copied by Ansoaldus.
 XXVIII, 35, 7 [*pleni]-us nitidiusque* to XXX, 5, 7 *deinceps continua amplexus* copied by Landemarus.

III. MISTAKEN WORD-DIVISIONS

The comparative freedom of Capital and Uncial manuscripts from serious corruptions is due in large measure to the fact that the words of the text were usually¹ not divided. The letters of the text were written one after the other, with no interruption except an occasional break to indicate the paragraph; consequently it was never absolutely necessary for the scribe in making his copy to follow the sense of what he was copying. He might evade all difficulties arising from his own ignorance

¹ In the poem on the battle of Actium, found at Herculaneum, and in some early Virgil manuscripts, the words, though not spaced, are divided by points. This however was exceptional.

or from corruptions in his original, by simply writing the letters one by one without puzzling over the words they formed. He might indeed, as he copied, make wrong mental divisions of the words; but, if he did not in forming such wrong mental divisions also add, omit, or change a letter, his error could not in any way affect the text of his copy.

With the closing years of the eighth century, however, as a result of the Caroline reform, it became the regular practice to write each word separately. The Carolingian scribe, when set to make a copy of a continuously written majuscule manuscript, was forced to write his copy not letter by letter, but word by word. To do this rightly demanded a knowledge of the context, and the ability to read and understand Latin,—in which, as examples will clearly show, the eight scribes of R were anything but proficient. Their work is consequently full of wrong divisions of words, both where the sense of the passage was perfectly plain, and where corruptions in the original made the division really difficult. When in doubt, the scribes occasionally left the words undivided; but, as a rule, they resorted more or less blindly to some random grouping of the letters.

Errors of this nature form by far the largest class of the mistakes made by the scribes of R, and many of the illustrations given under other headings can be indirectly traced to this source. These errors due to wrong division of words are in themselves comparatively insignificant, and, were the *Puteanus* lost, the emendation of this class of corruptions in the *Reginensis* would present little or no difficulty to a modern scholar. But the serious aspect of such errors is that they form the starting-point of further and more formidable corruptions in eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth century copies of ninth century manuscripts. The scribes of a later age had education enough to recognize that there were errors, but not sufficient knowledge or care to rectify them; and, in the superficial attempts which they made at restoring sense to the passages, all clues by which they might be emended by more careful scholars were frequently lost.

Before proceeding to take up in detail the various kinds of error arising from this source, I shall first give a few examples, chosen at random, of some of the more absurd word-divisions, in which the efforts of the scribes have resulted in nonsense, or in combinations of letters which do not form Latin words.¹

XXV, 11, 3 uallo urbem ab arce *intersaepire* statuit P, inter saepi restatuit R. — XXV, 11, 14–15 censebant esse. Punicas enim . . . P, censebantes sepunicas enim R. — XXV, 11, 17 haut magna mole P, haut magnam ole R. — XXV, 18, 11 pertulere (perpulere *Luchs*) turmales P, per tuleretur males R. — XXV, 40, 2 uertit. Visebantur enim . . . P, uertitui seabantur enim R. — XXV, 40, 6 ita peruagatus est hostium *agros ita socios* ad retinendos P, agrositas ocios R. — XXVIII, 25, 7 talia quaerentes (querentes *Luchs*) aequa orare seque ea . . . P, talia quaerentisae quaorares eque ea R. — XXVIII, 4, 2 frumentum *conuehere tela* arma parare P, conueheret ela R. — XXVIII, 5, 1 *mandata masinissae* scipioni exponit P, mandatam asinis sae R. — XXVIII, 8, 9 qui cum magno piaculo sacrillegii . . . P, magnopia culosacri legii R.

The first four of these examples have been selected from the portion copied by the scribe Nauto. He was the most careful of all the scribes in the matter of dividing words. In his three quaternions there are many more word-divisions quite as absurd as the four just given, and in the work of the other scribes they occur several times to the page. All of these examples are taken from a context in which the sense is perfectly clear. The scribes appear not to have grasped it and seem to have divided the letters at random.

Many of the errors of this class admit of no explanation except that of stupidity on the part of the scribe, but the greater number may be grouped into certain broad classes according to the conditions under which the errors occur.

¹ In giving the readings of P, I shall divide the words as they are divided in the printed texts. The reader will, however, understand that they are undivided in the manuscript. Where much of the context is given I have put in italics the part which is wrongly divided in R.

The easiest and simplest form of error in the division of words is to be found in the case of groups of letters which admit of being divided in two different ways, both of which give actual Latin words, *e.g.* XXVIII, 36, 8 *ad muros tumultu maiore quam ui subierunt* P. Here the scribe Landemarus has written *quam uis ubi erunt*. He was satisfied with having made four Latin words and did not stop to think of the sense of the passage.

Other examples are : XXII, 25, 14 *si penes se summa imperii consiliiue sit* P, *consilii quesit* R. *Quesit* is no doubt meant for *quaesit*. — XXIII, 35, 8 *cogere tueri* P, *cogeret ueri* R. — XXIII, 46, 12 *cognomine Taurea* P, *cognominet aurea* R. — XXIII, 15, 4 *fortissimus quisque pugnator esse desiderat* P. R has for the last three words *pugnatores sedesierat*; this gave trouble to the scribe who copied M, and in that manuscript *fortissimus* is made to agree with *pugnatores*. Thus M has *fortissimos quisque pugnatores sedesierat*. — XXV, 40, 12 *degenerem Afrum* P, *degenere mafrum* R. — XXV, 41, 1 *arma prope|re capere* P, *arma prope recapere* R. — XXV, 41, 2 *effusis equis* P, *effusi se quis* R. — XXVI, 27, 14 *se minime censere* P, *semini me censere* R. — XXVI, 40, 3 *Carthaginien-sium* P, *Carthagini ensium* R. — XXVI, 51, 13 *at ubi adpropinquare tres duces* P, *adpropinquaret res* R. — XXVIII, 25, 9 *in praesentia ut coepisset* P, *in praesenti aut coepisset* R. — XXVIII, 33, 6 *quam quantam edere leuia . . .* P, *quam quanta medere leuia* R. — XXVIII, 33, 16 *ad partem pugnae capessendae* (*capessendam Luchs*) *steterat* P, *capessenda est et erat* R.

Frequently the scribe's uncertainty in the division of words is caused by the possibility that a given letter may be either the final letter of one word or the initial letter of the next, *e.g.* in the above list *cogeret ueri* for *cogere tueri*.

This is the case particularly with the letter *s*. It will be possible to give only a few examples in comparison with the large numbers to be found of this species of error. XXII, 43, 2 *apud milites . . . mixtos ex conluuionem* (= *conluuione*) P,

mixtos sex R. — XXIII, 15, 6 eques etiam *in hostes emissus* P, in hoste semissus R. Here the division is partly due to *in*, which the scribe supposed should take the ablative. — XXIII, 16, 12 ne discrimen omne *uirtutis ignauiaequae* pereat P, uirtuti signauiaequae R. — XXV, 12, 3 praetori sullae P, praetoris ullae R. — XXV, 15, 11 in aciem *copias educit* P, copia se ducit R. — XXV, 40, 2 hostium quidem *illa spolia* P, illas polia R. — XXV, 40, 5 omnis belli *artes edoctus* P, arte se doctus R. — XXVI, 27, 13 uestigia sceleris P, uestigias celeris R. — XXVI, 29, 2 in consulum *conspectu stantis* P, conspectus tantis R. — XXVI, 34, 13 iamq. (= Q.) fuluii saeuitiam P, iamque fuluii aeuitiam R. — XXVI, 36, 11 in publicis tabulis esse P² (P¹ has *tabulis tabulis*), in publici stabulis esse R. — XXVI, 39, 13 pedestres acies urgebant P, pedestres acie surgebant R. — XXVIII, 5, 4 *mitti sibi* ab domo praesidia P, mittis ibi R.

False word-divisions are also very common in cases where a word ending with *a* is followed by a word beginning with *e*. The scribes were prone to regard the final *a* and the initial *e* as a diphthong, and to place the *ae* at the end of the first of the two words, thus changing a nominative into a genitive or dative case, or into a nominative plural, or adding the ending to words which did not admit of it. Examples of this class of error are :

XXII, 33, 9 comitia edicturum P, comitiae dicturum R. — XXII, 37, 9 cui prouincia *sicilia euenisset* P, siciliae uenisset R. — XXIII, 4, 5 in qua e|doctus (eductus *Luchs*) P, in quae doctus R. — The mistake was aided by the fact that in P the line ended with *e*. — XXV, 40, 13 pugnae fortuna euenisset P, pugnae fortunae uenisset R. This was also the reading of M, but an ignorant corrector emended to *pugnae fortuna uenisset*. — XXV, 41, 13 lentulo sardinia e|uenit P; here *e* ends the line, causing the scribe of R to divide wrongly *lentulo sardiniae uenit*. — XXVI, 26, 6 crimina edita ficta P, criminae dita ficta R. — XXVI, 33, 9 quorum culpa eminebat P, quorum culpae minebat R; which is emended by a corrector in M to *quorum culpa minebat*. — XXVI, 44, 4 submissa e castris P, submissae castris

R. — XXVIII, 2, 5 qua equitatum P, quae quitatum R. — XXVIII, 2, 11 procella equestri P, procellae questri R. — XXVIII, 16, 3 grata ea patribus admonitio P, gratae a patribus admonitio R.

Naturally the tendency would be to place the diphthong at the end of the first word, inasmuch as there it forms an ending. Examples in which the *ae* is placed at the beginning of the second word are very few, *e.g.*: XXVIII, 1, 10 quia edictum imperatoris erat P, qui aedictum peratoris erat R. There *ae* is regarded as the equivalent of *e*.

Sometimes a final *ae* is broken up so that the *e* is attached to the following word, *e.g.*: XXII, 26, 1 ad spem liberalioris *fortunae iecit* (fecit *Luchs*) P, fortuna eiecit R. — XXVI, 34, 11 capuae iusserunt P, capua eius erunt R.

Errors of a somewhat similar nature arise from the phonetic equivalence of *ae* and *e* in the middle ages, *e* being written instead of the final diphthong. Examples are: XXIII, 49, 12 prouincia ut quae maxime P, prouinci aut quem axime R. — XXVIII, 10, 8 quae ratio transportandae P, queratio transportandae R. — XXVI, 36, 12 scribae referundo P, scribere ferundo R, an error which has been copied into M.

A fruitful cause of errors of all kinds¹ is the occurrence of proper names or other strange words with which the scribes were not familiar. Its influence is often felt in the division of words. *E.g.*: XXIII, 1, 12 a Claudio² praetore P, ac laudio praetore R. — XXIII, 17, 8 *omissa spe Nola* potiundae P, omissas penolae R. — XXV, 40, 6 et Hannone Numidae P, et hanno nenumidae R. The scribe of M wrote first et hanno numide. — XXVI, 28, 1 Aetoli Acarnanes Locrique P, aetolia carnanes locrique R. — XXVI, 41, 11 . . . sensi. Trebia . . . P, sensit rebia R. — XXVI, 41, 13 uadenti Hasdrubali ad Alpīs R, uadenti hasdrubalia dalpīs R. — XXVIII,

¹ See chap. XI, on Emendation.

² For the reader's convenience I have inserted capitals in the proper names in giving the readings of P. There is, of course, no distinction in the manuscript itself.

12, 14 ab Romanis Ilienses P, ad romani silienses R. — XXVIII, 24, 12 *ad Cannas ignaviae* eorum P, ad canna signaviae R. An excellent example of the trouble which the scribes had with Latin proper names is the prophecy of Marcius, XXV, 12, 5. Here P has Amnem Troiugenam Ro|manae fugae (= Romane fuge) Cannam|ne te alienigenae cogant in campo Diome|dis conserere manus. This is written in R as follows: amnemtroiugenam romanae fugae kannam ne te alienigenae cogant in campodio me dis conserere manus.

In the foregoing examples the scribes have merely divided the letters in such a way as to form words not intended by the author. The error does not always stop here, however, and a second error is often a consequence of the first. The scribe, having begun with a wrong word-division, finds after he has written one or more words that he has a residuum of letters which do not make a word. He is compelled, therefore, by a conscious or unconscious alteration of the text to form a word out of what is left of the group of letters. This is usually done in some such simple way as the changing of a single letter or the addition of a letter necessary to the formation of a word. These additions or alterations are made for the most part quite unconsciously. The unbroken array of letters which are not grouped in any way is responsible for the illusion of the scribe. Enough letters are left to suggest a word to his mind, and he does not notice that he has mentally changed a letter or added one which was not there.¹ Sometimes individual habits of spelling and pronunciation are also factors in causing the additional error. In the lists of examples I shall also include a few cases in which the scribe has merely divided the words wrongly, and the alterations have been made consciously by the correctors or by the scribes on second reading.

(1) Examples of the change of a letter: XXVI, 40, 1 *consul*

¹ These errors which result from mental word-division are not confined to manuscripts of the ninth century and later. They are also frequent in the continuously written manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries. See Heraeus, *Quaestiones Criticae et Palaeographicae de Vetustissimis Codicibus Livianis*, § 1, 'Incrementa orationis ex verborum prava distinctione nata.'

iam magna parte anni circumacta P, consilium magna per te R. — XXVIII, 28, 6 in sicilia messanam P, in siciliam esse nam R. — XXII, 34, 10 dictator esset P, dictatores sed R. — XXVI, 40, 18 hos neque relinquere laevinus in insula tum primum noua pace coalescente *velut materiam nouandis rebus satis tutum* ratus est, (*Luchs*); uelut materiam nouamdis reb. satis tutum P, uelut materiam nouam disrepsatis tutum R. Here the scribe, thinking that *disreb. satis* formed a single word, consciously or unconsciously made the phonetic change of *b* to *p* before *s*. — XXVI, 48, 10 *quod amoti tantae* dignitatis . . . fuerant P, quodam oti tantae R; a corrector has changed the unintelligible *oti* into *uti*, which makes a Latin word but does not help the sense in any way. — XXV, 16, 14 ibi paucis uerbis *transigi rem posse* P; *transigirem posse* was first written by the scribe of R, who subsequently changed it to *transigerem posse*, and finally to *transigere posse*. — XXVI, 39, 18 . . . mox praedae *fuere thurinis* metapontinisque. Ex onerariis quae *cum com- meatu sequebantur*, perpaucae in potestatem hostium uenere, (*Luchs*); mox praede *fuere thurinis* metapontinisque. Ex hone- rariis que *cum meatu sequabantur* . . . P. The scribe of R wrote . . . *fuere hurinis* . . . *cum meatus equabantur* . . . , and a cor- rector has changed *fuere* to *fuerit*. The passage was copied by the scribe of M, as follows: mox prede *fuerit hurinis* . . . quae *commeatus equabantur*.

(2) Examples of the addition of a letter: XXV, 11, 16 pla- nae et satis latae uiae *patent in omnis partes* P, patenti nominis partes R. — XXVI, 30, 10 orare se patres conscriptos, ut, *si nequeant omnia*, saltem quae comparent (compareant *Luchs*) cognoscique possint, restitui dominis iubeant P, sine que ante omnia R, *e* being added to make a word of the letters *ant* which were left over through the erroneous division of *sine* and *que*. — XXVI, 34, 9 *censuerunt ne quis* . . . haberet P, censuerunt inequis R. — XXII, 19, 10 in hanchoras (= anchoras) uehe- rentur P. The scribe in R has wrongly divided the passage and made of it *in hanc hora se ueherentur*; a corrector, in order to make *hora* agree in case with *hanc*, has altered the passage

to read *in hanc horam se ueherentur*. — The insertion of more than one letter by a scribe is unusual, though not uncommon in the work of the correctors. An example of the insertion of a syllable on the part of a scribe is to be found in XXII, 21, 3. Here P has *mandonius indebilisque* (= Indibilesque); the scribe of R having wrongly written *mandonius inde* found that the remaining letters *bilisque* did not make sense, and added a syllable to make *nobilisque*. The passage now reads in R *mandonius inde nobilisque*.

Mistaken word-divisions are not by any means the only errors for which the lack of word-division in the *Puteanus* is responsible. A very large proportion of the examples of dittography and haplography, of the unconscious substitution of one word for another, of omissions of all kinds, of confusion of letters, and of other forms of corruption which appear in R, find their real starting-point in the bewilderment caused the scribe by the unbroken array of letters which confronted him in his original. It should therefore be kept in mind, in considering the errors given in Chapters IV to IX, that this is in the majority of cases a secondary, if not a primary cause.

IV. DITTOGRAPHY

Dittography, the inadvertent repetition of a word, a syllable, or a letter, is a species of *lapsus calami* too common in our own writing to need further definition. It is a form of error to which the mediaeval scribe was perhaps a little more prone than we are for the reason that his task of copying manuscripts was almost entirely mechanical. In the case of the scribes of R, who were copying a manuscript in which there was no division of words, the opportunities for errors of this nature were greatly increased. Their mistakes were often due as much to the erring of the eye as to that of the hand, and for that reason were more likely to lead to corruption.

(1) *Dittography of a Letter*. — The largest number of examples in R of the dittography of a letter are due directly or

indirectly to the confusion of the eye of the scribe caused by the continuously written text of the uncial manuscript. In glancing back to the page of his model after having written a word or syllable, inasmuch as there was nothing in the line to indicate the place where he had taken his eye from the page, the scribe sometimes unconsciously allowed the last letter of the word just written to arrange itself with the next group of letters. The letter was thus written twice, once at the end of one word, and again at the beginning of the next. Such doubling of letters is sometimes a cause, and sometimes a result, of wrong word-division.

Examples : XXIII, 3, 9 arce satis . . . tuta P, arces satis . . . tuta R. — XXIII, 8, 20 lacus thrasumennus et *cannae*, *tristia* . . . exempla P, canna et tristia R. — XXIII, 14, 7 seruili supplicio P, seruilis supplitio R. — XXIII, 22, 15 quoniam eum P, quoniam meum R. — XXIII, 33, 3 iouis it (= id) templum est P, iouis sit templum est R. — XXVII, 43, 10 haec senatu scripta P, haec senatus scripta R. — XXVIII, 35, 5 animo speciem P, animos speciem R. — XXVIII, 24, 9 item *circum oram* maritimam P, circum moram R. — XXII, 19, 10 anchoralia (= ancoralia) P, ancora alia R. — XXIII, 44, 7 animaduertit P, anima aduertit R. — XXVIII, 3, 1 tradenda deditionemque P, tradenda adeditionemque R.

Sometimes the repetition of a letter is a mere accident of writing, the scribe unconsciously writing it a second time. These repetitions, which have nothing to do with the division of words and do not usually affect the sense of the passage, are comparatively unimportant and do not usually lead to corruptions. Examples are : XXVIII, 3, 14 defectione P, defec-tio|one R. — XXVIII, 36, 10 ettruriam P, ettruriam R. — XXIII, 18, 12 manu emiserat P, manuemisserat R. — XXIII, 23, 2 comitia . . . *habita*. *creatus* . . . andranodorus P, habita-acreatus R.

(2) *Dittography of Syllables and of Words*. — The repetition of syllables or words is not nearly so common as the repetition of a letter. Examples of the dittography of a word are com-

paratively few in R, and none would be likely to lead to further corruption unless the following: XXV, 41, 13 *pisoni iurisdictio urbana pupio sicilia . . . evenit* P. Here the scribe of R has written, *pisoni iurisdictio urbana pupio urbana sicilia . . . evenit*. XXIII, 38, 7 *aut vis aut fraus* timeri possit P, *aut ut visa ut fraus* R. An interesting repetition of a syllable is seen in XXVIII, 3, 5 *frumentum sex mensum imperatum sagaque et togae exercitui* P, *frumentum sex mensum imperatum sagatumque et togae exercitui* R.

[To be continued.]

F. W. SHIPLEY.